

### Remarks

Claims 1, 3, and 7 have been amended. Claim 10 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

#### **I. Interview Summary**

Preliminarily, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during the interview of April 15, 2004. During the interview, Renard and proposed amendments to claim 1 were discussed. Agreement was reached that the proposed recitation in claim 1 of simultaneously displaying the processed multi-carrier broadcast signals and the processed radio positioning signals was sufficient to overcome the rejections based on Renard. The amendments and remarks contained herein are consistent with the discussions held during the interview.

#### **II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In section 3 of the Action, claims 1-3, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as begin anticipated by Renard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,691. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claim 1 recites that the reception device simultaneously displays the processed multi-carrier digital audio broadcast signals and the processed radio global positioning signals. Such a configuration can be advantageous, for example, so that information contained in both signals can be leveraged to provide enhanced features for the user. See Application, page 2, lines 19-34.

In contrast, Renard discloses a device including only a single signal pathway, which requires a user to choose between a GPS signal and a GLONASS signal. Renard, col. 8, lines 40-47. Consequently, Renard fails to disclose or suggest a device that simultaneously displays processed multi-carrier digital audio broadcast signals and a processed radio global positioning signals, as recited by claim 1.

For at least this reason, reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2, 3, 6, and 9 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

**III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In section 5 of the Action, claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renard in view of Leung et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,719,573. In addition, in section 6 of the Action, claims 7 and 8 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renard in view of Oyagi, U.S. Patent No. 6,292,232. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejections is not conceded.

Claim 7 now depends from new claim 10.

Claims 4, 5, and 8 all depend from claim 1. Neither Leung nor Oyagi remedy the shortcomings of Renard noted above. Therefore, claims 4, 5, and 8 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**IV. New Claim 10**


New claim 10 is similar to that of claim 1, except that claim 10 recites only multi-carrier broadcast signals and radio positioning signals. However, for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1, claim 10 should be allowable over the cited art. Consideration and allowance of claim 10, as well as claim 7 that depends therefrom, are respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone interview will aide the examination of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 612.371.5265.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 29, 2004

By:   
Name: John J. Gresens  
Reg. No.: 33,112  
JJG/RAK